

**REMARKS**

Claims 12, 14, 20, 22, 24-28, 30-36, 38-43, 45-50, 52-57, 59-64 and 66-78 were pending when last examined. With this Supplemental Amendment, Applicants have amended claims 12, 14, 20, 22, 25, 26, 28, 32, 33, 36, 40, 43, 47, 50, 54, 57, 61, 64, and 68, and added claims 79-92. No new matter has been added. Support for the amendment can be found at least in FIGS. 2, 3, 11 and 12, and the corresponding description in the specification.

**Amendment to Previously Presented Claims**

Claims 12, 14, 20, 22, 25, 26, 28, 32, 33, 36, 40, 43, 47, 50, 54, 57, 61, 64, and 68 have been amended to more clearly describe the claimed subject matter.

**New Claims**

Claims 79-92 have been added. Applicants respectfully submit that the newly added claims are allowable.

Claims 79-84 depend from claim 12 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 12, as discussed in the Response dated Aug. 1, 2008. In particular applicants would like to emphasize that the combination and modification of the prior art as suggested by the Examiner would put a huge burden on the server in a broadcasting environment, because the server would have to (i) learn the detailed structure of each document to be updated at each of the clients and (ii) send to each of the clients separate update forms as shown in FIG. 3 of the Maesaka reference. In contrast, the claimed invention requires electronic documents having a hierarchical structure based on a prescribed syntax, so the server can send all clients the same update document which has a structure based on the same prescribed syntax.

Furthermore, these dependent claims may be allowable for additional reasons. For example, claim 79 recites that the invalid element in the update document includes the invalid fragment; claim 80 recites that the invalid element includes a fragment identifier to

identify the invalid fragment; claim 82 recites that the invalid element is provided to the client in the update document in accordance with the hierarchical structure of the electronic document; claim 83 recites that the invalid element includes information to be invalidated; and claim 84 recites that the update document indicates deletion of said invalid fragment from the electronic document based on an element identifier or an element version which indicates a date and a time. The references cited by the Examiner, however, lack these limitations. Thus, claims 79, 80 and 82-84 should be allowable. Claim 81 depends from claim 80 and should be allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claims 85-87 depend from claim 50 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 50, as discussed in the Response dated Aug. 1, 2008. Furthermore, these dependent claims may be allowable for additional reasons. For example, claims 85-87 require limitations similar to those discussed above with reference to claims 79-81. As the cited references fail to disclose these limitations, claims 82-84 should be allowable.

New independent claims 88 and 90 require features which, as discussed above, are not disclosed by the prior art and the combination suggested by the Examiner. Thus, these claims should be allowable. Claims 89, 91 and 92 are dependent claims which are allowable at least for the same reasons as their respective base claims. These dependent claims may also be allowable for additional reasons. For example, claims 89 and 92 require the update document to include the invalid fragment, which is not disclosed or fairly taught in the cited prior art.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants respectfully request that the pending claims be allowed and the case passed to issue. Should the Examiner wish to discuss the Application, it is requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned at (415) 772-7428.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1597.

Certificate of Mailing

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

9/2/08

Date

Richard A. Pask

Signature

Respectfully submitted,

Ferenc Pazmandi

By:

Ferenc Pazmandi  
Agent of Record  
Registration No. L0078  
FP/rp

September 2, 2008

SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP  
555 California Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94104-1715